

Occurrence Report

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

(Name of Facility)

Nuclear Waste Operations/Disposal

(Facility Function)

Carlsbad Area Office

Westinghouse Waste Isolation Div.

(Laboratory, Site, or Organization)

Name: XXXX

Title: ASSIST MGR

Telephone No.: XXXX

(Facility Manager/Designee)

Name: XXXX

Title: ASSIST MGR

Telephone No.: XXXX

(Originator/Transmitter)

Name:

Date:

(Authorized Classifier (AC))

1. Occurrence Report Number: ALO--WWID-WIPP-2001-0003

Broken Window in Cask Loading Room

2. Report Type and Date: Final

	Date	Time
Notification:	03/21/2001	15:34 (MTZ)
Initial Update:	05/04/2001	14:48 (MTZ)
Latest Update:	05/04/2001	14:48 (MTZ)
Final:	05/23/2001	07:19 (MTZ)

3. Occurrence Category: Off-Normal

4. Number of Occurrences: 1 **Original OR:**

5. Division or Project: WTS/Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

6. Secretarial Office: EM - Environmental Management

7. System, Bldg., or Equipment: Waste Handling Building/Remote Handling Area

8. UCNI?: No

9. Plant Area: RH Cask Loading RM

10. Date and Time Discovered: 03/19/2001 07:30 (MTZ)

11. Date and Time Categorized: 03/20/2001 10:43 (MTZ)

12. DOE Notification:

13. Other Notifications:

14. Subject or Title of Occurrence:

Broken Window in Cask Loading Room

15. Nature of Occurrence:

07) Value Basis Reporting

A. Cost Based Occurrences

16. Description of Occurrence:

At 0730 hours on 03/19/2001 a Remote Handling (RH) Engineer notified the Central Monitoring Room Operator of a broken window located in the Cask Loading room of the RH area. Initial investigation of the window did not show any signs of an item impacting the glass.

The window is a leaded glass, 4 foot by 4 foot and 7 1/2 inches thick and is located in the Cask Loading Room of the RH area. The window provides a view for an operator while at the control panel for some of the Cask Loading equipment.

The RH area is currently under some construction in preparation for start up of RH. The RH area has never contained radioactive material. Therefore, there is no possibility of radioactive contamination and the occurrence had no effect on site operation.

Initial cost estimates were below \$10,000. After further investigation by the Cognizant Engineer it was determined that the estimated cost was greater than \$10,000 (approximately \$50,000)..

17. Operating Conditions of Facility at Time of Occurrence:

Contact Handled Waste Storage Mode

18. Activity Category:

03 - Normal Operations

19. Immediate Actions Taken and Results:

The area was secured until the Cognizant Engineer and Facility Manager Designee evaluated the break. An investigation of the cause was initiated.

20. Direct Cause:

- 1) Equipment/Material Problem
 - B. Defective or Failed Material

21. Contributing Cause(s):**22. Root Cause:**

- 1) Equipment/Material Problem
 - B. Defective or Failed Material
-

23. Description of Cause:

The source of the cause could not be determined. There was no indication of impact on the window. The cognizant engineer determined the cause to be unclear.

24. Evaluation (by Facility Manager/Designee):

On March 19, 2001 the shield window that separates the operator's console from the facility cask rotating device in the cask loading room of the Waste Handling Building was observed to have cracked in the lower corner of the west side of the window. The cause of the fracture is unclear, as the surface does not appear to have been struck by an object. Remote Handling (RH) personnel have researched possible options for window replacement and the consequences of leaving the window in place.

Based on input from RH Operations, Industrial Safety, and Radiological Engineering, RH Engineering recommends that the window be left in place for now to monitor crack propagation. RH Engineering further suggests that a contingency to replace the window with an industrial grade window is the most cost effective option should the cracks propagate over time.

25. Is Further Evaluation Required?: No

26. Corrective Actions

(* = Date added/revised since final report was approved.)

1.

The Maintenance & Operating Contractor to provide DOE Carlsbad Field Office with a report of the investigation on the broken window. The report is to contain evaluations for replacement of the window with various options and the consequences.	
--	--

Target Completion Date: 05/04/2001	Completion Date: 04/02/2001
---	------------------------------------

27. Impact on Environment, Safety and Health:

None

28. Programmatic Impact:

None

29. Impact on Codes and Standards:

None

30. Lessons Learned:

None

31. Similar Occurrence Report Numbers:

1. None

32. User-defined Field #1:

33. User-defined Field #2:

34. DOE Facility Representative Input:

WIPP's FR concurs with the M&OC's assessment and its plan not to replace the window in the Cask Loading Room now.

Entered by: XXXX

Date: 05/23/2001

35. DOE Program Manager Input:

36. Approvals:

Approved by: XXXX Facility Manager/Designee

Date: 05/04/2001

Telephone No.: XXXX

Approved by: XXXX Facility Representative/Designee

Date: 05/23/2001

Telephone No.: XXXX

Approved by: Approval delegated to FR

Date: 05/23/2001

Telephone No.:
